



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ccm*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/295,607      | 04/22/1999  | SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI     | 740756-1961         | 7371             |

22204 7590 04/25/2007  
NIXON PEABODY, LLP  
401 9TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 900  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HU, SHOUXIANG

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2811

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 04/25/2007 | PAPER         |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/295,607

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Shouxiang Hu

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-8,11,12,15-17,19-35 and 37-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-3, 6-8, 11-12, 15-17, 19-35 and 37-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/085,931.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Previous Two Office Actions Vacated***

1. The previous two Office actions mailed on 2/06/2007 and 3/22/2007, including the restriction requirements set forth therein, are vacated, after reconsiderations in view of the prosecution history of the application.

### ***Allowability Withdrawn***

2. The indicated allowability of claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19-33, 35, 37-45 and 47-67 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Fukada et al. (US 6,268,631) and Kim et al. (US 5,270,263). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 2811

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 16, 22, 28, 31, 32, 34, 40, 43, 44, 46, 51, 54-56 and 60-67 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,631. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they each claim the substantially same subject matters of a semiconductor device comprising:

a substrate having a front surface and a rear surface;

an aluminum nitride insulating film containing therein oxygen provided under the rear surface and/or on the front surface of the substrate; and

a transistor provided over the front surface of the substrate, the transistor having at least a channel formation region comprising crystalline silicon, a gate insulating film adjacent to the channel formation region, and a gate electrode adjacent to the channel formation region with the gate insulating film interposed therebetween.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2811

6. Claims 2-3, 6-8, 11-12, 15-17, 19-35 and 37-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (Ikeda et al., JP 59-121876; of record) in view of Kim (Kim et al., US 5,270,263).

Ikeda discloses a semiconductor device (similar to Figs. 1a-1c; also see its English translation, especially see the second paragraph on page 4 in the translation), comprising:

- a substrate (11; glass) having a front surface and a rear surface;

- an aluminum nitride insulating film (12, which can be formed of AlN, see the second paragraph on page 4 in the translation; about 0.5 um thick) provided under the rear surface and/or on the front surface of the substrate; and

- a transistor provided over the front surface of the substrate, the transistor having at least a channel formation region comprising silicon (similar to 15a and/or 15b; it can be a crystalline silicon as it can be formed of polysilicon, see the second paragraph on page 4 in the translation), a gate insulating film (14) adjacent to the channel formation region, and a gate electrode (13 a and/or 13b) adjacent to the channel formation region with the gate insulating film interposed therebetween.

Ikeda further teaches that the aluminum nitride insulating film can be formed through sputtering.

Ikeda does not expressly disclose sufficient details about the sputtering process for forming the aluminum nitride insulating film, and/or that such insulating film through sputtering includes oxygen and/or carbon.

However, as evidenced in Kim (see the abstract, col. 1, lines 25-35; col. 3, lines 3-10, and col. 5, lines 38-39; also see Fig. 5), one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that an aluminum nitride insulating film (AlN; having a thermal conductivity of about 1.5 W/cm K) can be commonly and desirably formed through sputtering with a nitrogen gas being used as both the reactive gas and the sputtering gas for achieving desired high quality for the insulating film; and, the aluminum nitride insulating film formed through such sputtering process naturally contains (more or less) certain oxygen and/or carbon (see col. 5, lines 38-39; also see the naturally existing O and/or C in Fig. 5), as either of O and C is one of the nature's most abundant elements and it is normally unpractical to completely remove it from such a sputtering system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the semiconductor device of Ikeda with the aluminum nitride insulating film be formed through a nitrogen gas-based sputtering method, per the teachings of Kim, so that a semiconductor device with desired high quality in the aluminum nitride insulating film therein would be obtained. And, with the aluminum nitride insulating film being formed through the nitrogen gas-based sputtering method of Kim, the aluminum nitride insulating film in the semiconductor device collectively taught above by Ikeda and Kim would inherently and/or naturally include certain oxygen and/or carbon therein.

Regarding claims 43-53, 55 and 58, it is noted that the limitations recited in these claims regarding how the recited channel formation region is crystallized are process limitations. And, these would not carry patentable weight in the claims drawing to a

Art Unit: 2811

structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Regarding claims 54-67, it is noted that: it is well known in the art (as readily evidenced in the prior art such as US 5,032,883 to Wakai et al.; see the cover page figure) that a thin film transistor can be desirably covered by an interlayer insulating film (108) having a leveled upper surface underlying a pixel electrode (110), so as to form a display device with a desired substantially flat pixel electrode and/or with a desired passivation for the transistor and/or desired electrical stability for the device.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims rejected above have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reference A is cited as being related to a planarized interlayer in a TFT-based display device.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shouxiang Hu whose telephone number is 571-272-1654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2811

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard T. Elms can be reached on 571-272-1869. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SH  
April 13, 2007



**SHOUXIANG HU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**